REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

35 USC § 103

Claims 1 - 6 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,606,525 to Muthuswamy et al. (hereinafter "Muthuswamy") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0115066 to Seeley et al. (hereinafter "Seeley") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0073867 to Kausik et al. (hereinafter "Kausik").

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, includes "a report manager connected to the processor to monitor execution of the voice application and generate statistics associated with a plurality of voice application deployments, wherein the statistics are generated upon initial execution of the voice application and after modification of the voice application...."

The language of amended claim 1 describes a system that includes a report manager that is capable of generating statistics regarding multiple deployments of a voice application. These statistics are generated when the voice application is initially executed and after any modifications to the voice application.

The Muthuswamy reference discloses a "System and method of merging static data in web pages". (See Muthuswamy Title). This disclosure of a system and method for merging static data does not disclose or suggest the use of a report manager of the type recited in amended claim 1. This type of report manager is not relevant to the

teachings of Muthuswamy and, accordingly, is not discussed or suggested in the reference.

The Seeley reference discloses "a method to automate the validation of dynamic data presented over telecommunications paths." (See Seeley Abstract). The Seeley reference fails to disclose or suggest the report manager as recited in amended claim 1. Such a repot manager is not relevant to the teachings of Seeley which are focused on validation of data, not managing deployment of a voice application. Accordingly, the report manager recited in amended claim 1, is not discussed or suggested by Seeley.

The Kausik reference fails to remedy the deficiencies of Muthuswamy and Seeley. Kausik fails to disclose or suggest the report manager recited in claim 1. The Kausik reference is directed toward the precomputation of web documents and makes no reference to a report manager. Such a report manager is not relevant to the disclosure of Kausik.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Muthuswamy, Seeley and Kausik, alone or in any permissible combination, fail to disclose or suggest the teaching of amended claim 1. Since neither Muthuswamy, Seeley nor Kausik makes any reference to the report manager of the type disclosed in claim 1, the combination of Muthuswamy, Seeley and Kausik fails to disclose or suggest this portion of claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Muthuswamy in view of Seeley and Kausik. Given that claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Muthuswamy in view of Seeley and Kausik for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Muthuswamy in view of Seeley and Kausik, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,941,512 to Lebin Cheng (hereinafter "Cheng").

The Cheng reference discloses "A method and apparatus for unfolding dynamic web content in a wireless information gateway for presentation on wireless information devices." (See Cheng Abstract). The disclosure of Cheng is related to the handling of content in a wireless environment, and fails to make any reference to the report manager of the type disclosed in claim 1. Such a report manager is unrelated to the focus of the Cheng reference. As such, the Cheng reference fails to remedy the deficiencies of Muthuswamy, Seeley and Kausik discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Muthuswamy, Seeley, Kausik and Cheng (alone or in any permissible combination thereof) fail to disclose or suggest the invention of claim 1.

Accordingly, since claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Muthuswamy in view of Seeley and Kausik, and further in view of Cheng.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Muthuswamy in view of Seeley and Kausik, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0019881 to Bokhari et al. (hereinafter "Bokhari").

The Bokhari reference discloses "applying a function to a habitat for universal application of a function to data for output on and/or access from any remote client device." (Paragraph 0008). The disclosure of Bokhari fails to teach or suggest the type of report manager recited in claim 1. The report manager is not related to the disclosure

of Bokhari and, accordingly, is not discussed by the Bokhari reference. As such, Bokhari fails to remedy the deficiencies of Muthuswamy, Seeley and Kausik discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Muthuswamy, Seeley, Kausik and Bokhari (alone or in any permissible combination thereof) fail to disclose or suggest the invention of claim 1.

Accordingly, since claim 9 depends from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is likewise allowable over Muthuswamy in view of Seeley and Kausik, and further in view of Bokhari.

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Muthuswamy in view of Seeley and Kausik, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0123278 to Nanja et al. (hereinafter "Nanja").

The Nanja reference discloses a system for persistent caching of data. The disclosure of Nanja fails to make any reference to the report manager of the type recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the Nanja reference fails to remedy the deficiencies of Muthuswamy, Seeley and Kausik discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Muthuswamy, Seeley, Kausik and Nanja (alone or in any permissible combination thereof) fail to disclose or suggest the invention of claim 1.

Accordingly, since claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Muthuswamy in view of Seeley and Kausik, and further in view of Nanja.

Conclusion

Claims 1-11 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: April 8, 2008

By: _____

Steven R. Sponseller
Reg. No. 39,384
(509) 389-0584